

REMARKS

Claims 19-37 are all the claims pending in the application.

In the last Office Action Claim 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 37 has been amended to depend from Claim 36 as suggested by the Examiner.

In the last Office Action, Claims 19, 20, 36 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kunstler in view of Chanteur and Cienkus, Jr. *et al.* Claims 21-24 and 30-35 were allowed. Claims 25-29 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

With respect to the rejection of Claims 19 and 20, the Examiner appears to have completely overlooked the rationale of the Board of Appeals in reversing the rejection of Claim 19 as being unpatentable over Kunstler in view of Chanteur. Claim 19 incorporates the limitations of Claim 18 which is now cancelled and further recites "T-shaped plug connectors each for connecting an end portion of one of the transverse structures to respective end portions of two of the flexible bars". While Chanteur does disclose T-shaped connectors (T-shaped angle irons (5', 21') for connecting the stem (22) to the upper rigidification rod (4) and to the cross brace (29), Chanteur teaches connecting the tubes (23, 24, 25) with sleeves (26, 27). Chanteur provides no teaching or suggestion to connect tubes, bars or rods together, much less to flexible bars of each upright end to end using T-shaped plug connectors as called for in Claim 19. The mere fact that Kunstler could be modified to use T-shaped connectors to connect the transverse

struts to the uprights would not have made the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. Thus, the Board would not sustain the rejection of Claim 19 in view of Kunstler and Chanteur.

The addition of the Cienkus, Jr. *et al.* reference to the combination of references fails to introduce any disclosure which would in any way affect the reasoning of the Board of Appeals in reversing the rejection of Claim 19 based on the other two references. Cienkus Jr. *et al.* simply discloses a T-shaped connector for connecting two metallic elements at right angles to each other. Thus, Cienkus Jr. *et al.* does not disclose anything above and beyond the disclosure of Chanteur insofar as the combination of references are concerned.

Claim 20 was previously allowed before the Appeal to the Board of Appeals. The addition of the Cienkus Jr. *et al.* patent to the combination of Kunstler and Chanteur does not add anything which would support the rejection of Claim 20. Once again, the patent to Cienkus Jr. *et al.* does not add anything to the combination of references which was not previously provided by Chanteur. In fact, Cienkus Jr. *et al.* is not even directed to the same field of art and simply shows a T-shaped connector which was previously shown by Chanteur. Therefore, it is submitted that Claim 20 should also be allowed.

With respect to Claims 36 and 37, it is pointed out that Claim 36 specifically calls for a presentation device comprising a base, a flexible stand plugged into the base and holding means for holding a presentation carrier between the stand and the base. The flexible stand comprises two uprights each formed of flexible bars plugged together and at least two transverse struts plugged to the flexible bars of the uprights and connecting the uprights together to form a

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
USSN 09/700,258
Attorney Docket Q61663
November 3, 2005

double-H shape. Claim 36 further calls for a connector for connecting an end portion of one of the transverse struts to respective end portions of two of the flexible bars. Finally, the claim calls for the connector including a first hole for receiving the end portion of one transverse strut and second and third holes for receiving the respective end portions of the two flexible bars with the second and third holes being perpendicular to the first hole (see Figure 13). Claim 37 further specifies that the first, second and third holes form a T-shaped configuration. There is absolutely nothing in any of the three references which would disclose or suggest such a specific construction of the T-shaped connector as well as the manner in which it is used as called for in Claim 36. There is no teaching or disclosure in any of the three references of connecting the opposed ends of two uprights and a transverse strut together using such a specific connector. While Chanteur and Cienkus Jr. *et al.* both disclose T-shaped connectors, neither one of these references have three holes as specifically called for in Claim 36 and 37. Therefore, it is submitted that Claim 36 and 37 are allowable over the prior art.

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments it is submitted that Claims 19, 20, 36 and 37 are patentable over the teachings of Kunstler in view of Chanteur and Cienkus Jr. *et al.* Therefore, it is respectfully requested that Claims 19-37 inclusive be allowed and the application passed to issue forthwith.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
USSN 09/700,258
Attorney Docket Q61663
November 3, 2005

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Robert V. Sloan
Registration No. 22,775

Date: November 3, 2005